

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 8, 9, 24, 38 and 39 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-7, 10-13, 15-23, 25-28, 30-37, 40-43 and 45 are being cancelled herewith. Applicants request entry of this amendment after final as placing this case in condition for allowance or better form for appeal.

### **I. 35 U.S.C. § 102, Anticipation**

The Examiner rejected Claims 1, 11-13, 16, 26-28, 31 and 41-43 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Nielsen (US Pat No. 5,899,975, 5/4/99, filed 4/3/97). This rejection is respectfully traversed, as Applicants are canceling such claims herewith, without prejudice or disclaimer, such that this case can expeditiously pass to issuance. Such cancelled claims may be pursued in a continuation application.

Therefore, the rejection of Claims 1, 11-13, 16, 26-28, 31 and 41-43 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 has been overcome.

### **II. 35 U.S.C. § 103, Obviousness**

The Examiner rejected Claims 2-7, 15, 17-23, 30, 32-37 and 45 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Nielsen and further in view of Walsh, *The Extensible Style Language: {XSL} Styling XML Documents*, Web Techniques, Jan 1999, vol. 4, iss. 1, pg. 49, 5 pgs, printed from ProQuest as pages 1-10). This rejection is respectfully traversed, as Applicants are canceling such claims herewith, without prejudice or disclaimer, such that this case can expeditiously pass to issuance. Such cancelled claims may be pursued in a continuation application.

Therefore, the rejection of Claims 2-7, 15, 17-23, 30, 32-37 and 45 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 has been overcome.

### **III. 35 U.S.C. § 103, Obviousness**

The Examiner rejected Claims 10, 25 and 40 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Nielsen in view of Walsh and further in view of Feibus, *Visual InterDev Improves, InformationWeek*, September 28, 1998, Iss. 702, pg. 18A, 2 pgs, printed from ProQuest as pages 1-3. This rejection is respectfully traversed, as Applicants are canceling such claims herewith, without prejudice or disclaimer, such that this case can expeditiously pass to issuance. Such cancelled claims may be pursued in a continuation application.

Therefore, the rejection of Claims 10, 25 and 40 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 has been overcome.

**IV. Objection to Claims**

The Examiner stated that Claims 8, 24, 38 and 39 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. In response, the claims have been rewritten accordingly to overcome this objection. Thus, amended Claims 8, 24, 38 and 39 are allowable.

**V. Allowable Claim**

Applicants graciously acknowledge the allowance of Claim 9.

**VI. Conclusion**

Applicants request entry of this amendment after final as all remaining claims after such entry were indicated as being allowed or allowable in the most recent Office Action. It is respectfully urged that the subject application is patentable over the cited references and is now in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number if in the opinion of the Examiner such a telephone conference would expedite or aid the prosecution and examination of this application.

DATE: August 28, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

/Wayne P. Bailey/

Wayne P. Bailey  
Reg. No. 34,289  
Yee & Associates, P.C.  
P.O. Box 802333  
Dallas, TX 75380  
(972) 385-8777  
Attorney for Applicants